

CONSULTANT SELECTION COMBINED CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description

Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes

Project Number

2022-066

Name of Selection Panel Chair

Suzanne Gilbert

Number of Submitting Firms:	5
-----------------------------	---

Phase 1 - SOQ	Date:	8/17/2021		1	Number of Subr	nitting Firms:	5
Firms	Suzanne Gilbert Rank Order	Yelena Semenova Rank Order	Sachin Saldanha Rank Order	Bradford Olson Rank Order	Linda Newcomb Rank Order	TOTAL PANEL RANKED SCORE	PHASE 1 RANK ORDER
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	1	2	1	1	2	7	1
2 Cortner Architectural	2	4	3	4	3	16	4
3 WJA Design Collaborative	4	1	4	2	1	12	2
4 Ankrom Moisan	5	5	5	5	5	25	5
5 KMB Architects	3	3	2	3	4	15	3
7 8 9							
<u>10</u>							
12 13							
14 15							
16 17							
18							
20							
Phase 2 Interview	Date:	8/31/2021	I		umber of Firms	Interviewed:	3
Firms	Suzanne Gilbert	Yelena Semenova	R OF COMMITTE Sachin Saldanha	Bradford Olson	Linda Newcomb	TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order		
1 WJA Design Collaborative	1	1	3	3	1	9	1
2 KMB Architects	2	2	2	2	3	11	3
3 Schreiber Starling Whitehead 4 5	3	3	1	1	2	10	2

Linda Newcomb

Yelena Semenova



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Military Readiness Center Design -**Anacortes**

Consensus Date

Project Number

8/17/2021

2022-066

Name of Selection Panel Member

Suzanne Gilbert

	CRITERIA		Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		ole Design rience	TOTAL RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
	Scores	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	ore 10%		SCORE	
1	Schreiber Starling Whitehead	85.0	21.3	98.0	29.4	95.0	23.8	98.0	9.8	90.0	9.0	466.0	93.2	1
2	Cortner Architectural	90.0	22.5	91.0	27.3	91.0	22.8	91.0	9.1	90.0	9.0	453.0	90.7	2
3	WJA Design Collaborative	81.0	20.3	79.0	23.7	90.0	22.5	91.0	9.1	90.0	9.0	431.0	84.6	4
4	Ankrom Moisan	81.0	20.3	75.0	22.5	75.0	18.8	75.0	7.5	91.0	9.1	397.0	78.1	5
5	KMB Architects	90.0	22.5	91.0	27.3	90.0	22.5	93.0	9.3	90.0	9.0	454.0	90.6	3
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														
COI	MMENTS:													

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

8/17/2021

Suzanne Gilbert



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

Military Readiness Center Design Anacortes

Consensus Date

Project Number

8/17/2021

2022-066

Name of Selection Panel Member

Yelena Semenova

CRITERIA			Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
	Scores	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		100.0	25.0	100.0	30.0	100.0	25.0	95.0	9.5	96.0	9.6	491.0	99.1	2
2 Cortner Architectural		98.0	24.5	97.0	29.1	95.0	23.8	91.0	9.1	90.0	9.0	471.0	95.5	4
3 WJA Design Collaborative		100.0	25.0	100.0	30.0	100.0	25.0	96.0	9.6	98.0	9.8	494.0	99.4	1
4 Ankrom Moisan		98.0	24.5	90.0	27.0	93.0	23.3	93.0	9.3	92.0	9.2	466.0	93.3	5
5 KMB Architects		100.0	25.0	100.0	30.0	100.0	25.0	94.0	9.4	95.0	9.5	489.0	98.9	3
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17			_		_		_							
18			_											
19			_		_		_							
20														
COMMENTS:		•										•		

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

COMMENTS:

Senentra

8/17/2021

Yelena Semenova

Data



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description
Military Readiness Center Design -
Anacortes

Consensus Date

Project Number

8/17/2021

2022-066

Name of Selection Panel Member

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record Sachin Saldanha

CRITERIA		Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		RAW	WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
	Scores	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		22.0	5.5	28.0	8.4	23.0	5.8	6.0	0.6	8.0	0.8	87.0	21.1	1
2 Cortner Architectural		20.0	5.0	22.0	6.6	20.0	5.0	5.0	0.5	5.0	0.5	72.0	17.6	3
3 WJA Design Collaborative		18.0	4.5	17.0	5.1	18.0	4.5	3.0	0.3	6.0	0.6	62.0	15.0	4
4 Ankrom Moisan		18.0	4.5	15.0	4.5	16.0	4.0	6.0	0.6	6.0	0.6	61.0	14.2	5
5 KMB Architects		21.0	5.3	26.0	7.8	21.0	5.3	6.0	0.6	7.0	0.7	81.0	19.6	2
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														
COMMENTS:		. L		· L										

Staldanha	
101	8/17/2021
Sachin Saldanha	Date



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET Project description Military Readiness Center Design -**Anacortes**

Consensus Date Project Number

8/17/2021

2022-066

Name of Selection Panel Member

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

				_	
Rra	di	^	rd	O	Ison

CRITERIA		Qualification of Key Personnel			Relevant Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		Sustainable Design Experience		TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
	Scores	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		83.0	20.8	85.0	25.5	85.0	21.3	80.0	8.0	80.0	8.0	413.0	83.5	1
2 Cortner Architectural		80.0	20.0	80.0	24.0	80.0	20.0	75.0	7.5	77.0	7.7	392.0	79.2	4
3 WJA Design Collaborative		82.0	20.5	83.0	24.9	86.0	21.5	80.0	8.0	79.0	7.9	410.0	82.8	2
4 Ankrom Moisan		75.0	18.8	78.0	23.4	79.0	19.8	80.0	8.0	78.0	7.8	390.0	77.7	5
5 KMB Architects		78.0	19.5	82.0	24.6	84.0	21.0	80.0	8.0	80.0	8.0	404.0	81.1	3
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19			_		_									
20														
COMMENTS														

COMMENTS:



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description
Military Readiness Center Design -
Anacortes

Linda Newcomb

Consensus Date

Project Number

8/17/2021

2022-066

Name of Selection Panel Member

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

	CRITERIA		Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevant Experience		Past Performance		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		le Design ience	RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
	Score	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	10%	Raw Score	10%	SCORE	SCORE	
1	Schreiber Starling Whitehead	88.0	22.0	90.0	27.0	96.0	24.0	90.0	9.0	100.0	10.0	464.0	92.0	2
2	Cortner Architectural	80.0	20.0	83.0	24.9	92.0	23.0	70.0	7.0	70.0	7.0	395.0	81.9	3
3	WJA Design Collaborative	100.0	25.0	93.0	27.9	96.0	24.0	100.0	10.0	100.0	10.0	489.0	96.9	1
4	Ankrom Moisan	60.0	15.0	50.0	15.0	72.0	18.0	80.0	8.0	90.0	9.0	352.0	65.0	5
5	KMB Architects	72.0	18.0	77.0	23.1	80.0	20.0	70.0	7.0	80.0	8.0	379.0	76.1	4
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														

COMMENTS:

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Military Readiness Co	enter Design - Anacortes
Date of Evaluation	Project Number
8/31/2021	2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member	

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

This Scoresheet Be	et Becomes Public Record					Suzanne Gilbert							
CRITERIA	Weighting	WJA Design Collaborative		O I KMB Arch		Schreiber Starling Whitehead							
ONIENA	vveignting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score		
ORGANIZATION	20%	95.0	19.0	88.0	17.6	85.0	17.0						
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	for the Client.	What is the	eir philosoph	y towords wo	•	oratively with			•				
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	sent and what	role are the	y assuming	n the discus									
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo	ad for the dur	ation of the p	oroject and h	ow this proje	ct fits into th	ne firm's over	all planning						
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	95.0	23.8	88.0	22.0	81.0	20.3						
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the project scope in the past.	inalist's expe				•			now well hav	e they mana	ged develop	ment of		
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to expression of the strategies does the firm use to expression of the strategies does the firm use to expression of the strategies does the firm use to express	stablish and m	anage proje	ct budgets.	How succes	sful have the	ey been with	past project	S					
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well do	they listen	to client sch	edule needs	and then me	eet client sch	edule needs	i.					
PROJECT APPROACH	15%	95.0	14.3	81.0	12.2	81.0	12.2						
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define c						mational mto	, or done in	dependent re	esearch to b	etter underst	and the		
EXPERIENCE	20%	90.0	18.0	88.0	17.6	81.0	16.2						
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas											[
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual team	am members h	nave experie	ence that rela	tes to the pr	oject type or	complexity?	•						
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	93.0	9.3	90.0	9.0	81.0	8.1						
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive I ELCCA?	ife Cycle Cos	t exercise in	decision ma	king? Are th	ey familiar v	vith the OFM	requirement	ts? Are they	differentiati	ng between L	CCA and		
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0						
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	or this project	. How can th	ne sustainab	ility strategys	mesh with	the project b	udget.						
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Inclu	uded	Inclu	Included		ıded						
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	558.0		525.0		499.0							
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			93.3		87.4		82.7						
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		2		3						
COMMENTS:													

Suzanne Gilbert
Suzanne Gilbert (Sep 2, 2021 08:30 PDT)
Suzanne Gilbert

Sep 2, 2021

Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET This Scoresheet Recomes Public Record

Project description	
Military Readiness Center	Design - Anacortes
Date of Evaluation	Project Number
8/31/2021	2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member	

This Scoresheet Bed	This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record					Yelena Semenova								
CRITERIA	Weighting	WJA Design Collaborative		KMB Ar	chitects	Schreiber Starling Whitehead								
CRITERIA	weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score			
ORGANIZATION	20%	100.0	20.0	95.0	19.0	90.0	18.0							
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project for	or the Client.	What is the	eir philosoph	y towords wo	orking collab	oratively with	clients and	other outwa	rd looking is	ssues.				
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members prese	nt and what	role are the	y assuming	in the discus	sion									
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workload	d for the dura	ation of the p	oroject and h	now this proje	ect fits into th	ne firm's over	all planning							
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	100.0	25.0	95.0	23.8	90.0	22.5							
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the Fit project scope in the past.	nalist's expe	rience, how	well has the	team acertai	ned basic p	roject require	ments and I	now well hav	e they mana	aged develop	ment of			
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to esta	ablish and m	anage proje	ct budgets.	How succes	sful have the	ey been with	past project	s						
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules.	How well do	they listen	to client sch	edule needs	and then m	eet client sch	edule needs	S.						
PROJECT APPROACH	15%	100.0	95.0	95.0	90.0	90.0	13.5							
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements	ey have revi	ewed availa	ble project ir	nformation, a	ttended info	rmational mto	g, or done in	dependent r	esearch to b	etter unders	tand the			
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define cha	llenges and	/or opportun	ities they se	e for the proj	ect?									
EXPERIENCE	20%	100.0	20.0	100.0	20.0	100.0	20.0							
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past v					Ü		•							
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tean				1				1						
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	95.0	9.5	96.0	9.6	90.0	9.0							
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life ELCCA?	e Cycle Cos	t exercise in	decision ma	king? Are th	iey familiar v	with the OFM	requiremen	ts? Are they	differentiati	ng between I	LCCA and			
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	95.0	9.5							
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for	this project	. How can t	he sustainab	oility strategy:	s mesh with	the project b	udget.							
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Inclu	uded	Inclu	ıded	Inclu	ıded							
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	585.0		571.0		555.0								
<u> </u>			178.5		171.4		92.5							
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE														

Serrenor Sep 2, 2021 Yelena Semenova

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description

Military Readiness Center Design - Anacortes

Date of Evaluation

8/31/2021

Name of Selection Panel Member

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Sachin Saldanha

	CRITERIA V		Collab	Design orative	KMB Ar	chitects	Schreibe White	-				
	THE END	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION		20%	85.0	17.0	90.0	18.0	92.0	18.4				
	e team set up to manage this project f											
	Are the relevent team members prese											
Capacity/Prodution Capabilitie	es: Does the firm explain their workloa	d for the dur	ation of the p	project and h	now this proje	ect fits into th	ne firm's over	all planning				
PROJECT MANAGEMENT		25%	85.0	21.3	90.0	22.5	95.0	23.8				
Scope Management: Based of project scope in the past.	on the information provided and the Fi		•				, ,			,		
Budgeting & Cost Control: W	hat strategies does the firm use to esta											
Project Scheduling: How doe	s this finalist team develop schedules.	How well do	they listen	to client sch	edule needs	and then m	eet client sch	edule needs	S.			
PROJECT APPROACH		15%	85.0	12.8	90.0	13.5	95.0	14.3				
Understanding of this project: project and the project require	Has the Finalist demonstrated that the	ey have revi	ewed availa	ble project ir	nformation, a	ttended info	rmational mto	g, or done in	dependent r	esearch to b	etter unders	tand the
Challenges & Opportunities: F	las the Finalist attempted to define cha	allenges and	or opportun	ities they se	e for the proj	ect?						
EXPERIENCE		20%	88.0	17.6	90.0	18.0	95.0	19.0				
	Does the Finalist team discuss past v				•	•		•				
Relevant Past Projects (key te	eam members): Do the individual tean	1		ence that rela	·	oject type o	r complexity?			I		F
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYS	IS EXPERIENCE	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0				
Does the Finalist team unders ELCCA?	stand the value in a comprehensive Lif	e Cycle Cos	t exercise in	decision ma	iking? Are th	ney familiar v	with the OFM	requirement	ts? Are they	differentiati	ng between I	_CCA and
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXF	PERIENCE	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	92.0	9.2				
What strategies have the Fina	alists indicated might be appropriate for	r this project	. How can tl	he sustainat	ility strategy:	s mesh with	the project b	udget.		1	•	
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLU (indicate included or not included)		Not Scored	Inclu	uded	Inclu	uded	Inclu	ıded				
TOTAL Raw SCORE		100%	523.0		540.0		559.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE				86.6		90.0		93.6				
				3		2		1				

Haldanho_
Sachin Saldanha

Sep 2, 2021

Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Military Readiness Center	Design - Anacortes
Date of Evaluation	Project Number
8/31/2021	2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member	

	This Scoresheet Be		Bradford Olson									
	CRITERIA	Weighting	Collaborative		KMB Ar	chitects	Schreiber Starling Whitehead					
	ORTERIA	vveignung	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION		20%	80.0	16.0	80.0	16.0	81.0	16.2				
Management Plan: How is	the team set up to manage this project f	or the Client	. What is the	eir philosoph	y towords wo	orking collab	oratively with	clients and	other outwa	rd looking is	ssues.	
Team Member Qualification	s: Are the relevent team members pres	ent and what	role are the	y assuming	in the discus	sion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabil	ities: Does the firm explain their workloa	d for the dur	ation of the p	oroject and h	now this proje	ect fits into the	ne firm's over	all planning				
PROJECT MANAGEMENT		25%	82.0	20.5	81.0	20.3	82.0	20.5				
	d on the information provided and the Fi	nalist's expe	rience, how	well has the	team acertai	ned basic p	roject require	ments and I	now well hav	e they mana	aged develop	oment of
project scope in the past. Budgeting & Cost Control:	What strategies does the firm use to est	ablish and m	anage proje	ct budgets.	How succes	sful have the	ev been with	past project	s			
	pes this finalist team develop schedules.											
PROJECT APPROACH		15%	80.0	12.0	82.0	12.3	82.0	12.3				
	ct: Has the Finalist demonstrated that th	l							dependent r	esearch to b	etter unders	tand the
project and the project requ	irements								· 			
Challenges & Opportunities	: Has the Finalist attempted to define ch	allenges and	or opportun	ities they se	e for the proj	ect?						
EXPERIENCE		20%	81.0	16.2	81.0	16.2	83.0	16.6				
Relevant Past Projects (firm	n): Does the Finalist team discuss past v	work the firm	has done ar	nd <i>how</i> that	relates or pro	ovides guida	ance for this p	oroject?				
Relevant Past Projects (key	team members): Do the individual tear	m members I	nave experie	ence that rela	ates to the pr	oject type o	r complexity?	1				
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALY	SIS EXPERIENCE	10%	80.0	8.0	80.0	8.0	81.0	8.1				
Does the Finalist team unde	erstand the value in a comprehensive Lit	fe Cycle Cos	t exercise in	decision ma	king? Are th	ney familiar v	with the OFM	requiremen	ts? Are they	differentiati	ng between	LCCA and
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN E	XPERIENCE	10%	83.0	8.3	83.0	8.3	83.0	8.3				
What strategies have the Fi	nalists indicated might be appropriate fo	r this project	. How can tl	he sustainab	ility strategy:	s mesh with	the project b	udget.			•	
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCL (indicate included or not inc		Not Scored	Inclu	uded	Inclu	uded	Inclu	ıded				
TOTAL Raw SCORE		100%	486.0		487.0		492.0					
		l		81.0		81.1		82.0				
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCOR	E			01.0		01.1		02.0				

Brad Olson (Sep 2, 2021 07:33 PDT)
Bradford Olson

Sep 2, 2021

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Military Readiness Cente	r Design - Anacortes
Date of Evaluation	Project Number
8/31/2021	2022-066
Name of Selection Panel Member	

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Linda	Newcomb

CRITERIA	Weighting	Collab	Design orative	KMB Ar	chitects	Schreibe White	U				
- CHAILLIAN	vveignting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	20%	95.0	19.0	80.0	16.0	85.0	17.0				
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project f	or the Client	. What is the	eir philosoph	y towords w	orking collab	oratively with	clients and	other outwa	rd looking is	sues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members present	ent and what	role are the	y assuming	in the discus	sion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workloa	d for the dur	ation of the	project and h	ow this proje	ect fits into th	ne firm's over	all planning				
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	88.0	22.0	92.0	23.0	84.0	21.0				
<u>Scope Management</u> : Based on the information provided and the Fi project scope in the past.	nalist's expe	rience, how	well has the	team acerta	ined basic pi	oject require	ments and l	now well hav	e they mana	iged develop	ment of
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to est											
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules.	How well de	o they listen	to client sch	edule needs	and then m	eet client sch	edule needs	3.			
PROJECT APPROACH	15%	100.0	15.0	100.0	15.0	100.0	15.0				
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that th project and the project requirements	ey have revi	ewed availa	ble project ir	formation, a	ttended info	mational mt	g, or done in	dependent r	esearch to b	etter underst	tand the
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define ch	allenges and	or opportur	nities they se	e for the pro	ect?						
EXPERIENCE	20%	90.0	18.0	85.0	17.0	95.0	19.0				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past					•		•				
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tear	n members I	nave experie		ates to the pr	oject type o	complexity?)	ı	I	1	lassassassassassassassassassassas
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	10%	100.0	10.0	90.0	9.0	100.0	10.0				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Lit ELCCA?	e Cycle Cos	t exercise in	decision ma	king? Are th	ney familiar v	vith the OFM	requiremen	ts? Are they	differentiati	ng between I	LCCA and
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	100.0	10.0	90.0	9.0	100.0	10.0				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate fo	r this project	. How can t	he sustainat	ility strategy	s mesh with	the project b	udget.				
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored	Y	es	Y	es	Y	es				
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	573.0		537.0		564.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			94.0		89.0		92.0				
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		3		2				
COMMENTS:											

Linda Newcomb

Sep 2, 2021

Date

22-066-ScoresheetSummary

Final Audit Report 2021-09-02

Created: 2021-09-02

By: Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov)

Status: Signed

Transaction ID: CBJCHBCAABAAaeEqSJydvzTZWRRHaA7PBkJNshR1sYyO

"22-066-ScoresheetSummary" History

- Document created by Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov) 2021-09-02 0:05:54 AM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30
- Document emailed to Suzanne Gilbert (suzanne.gilbert@des.wa.gov) for signature 2021-09-02 0:13:24 AM GMT
- Document emailed to Yelena Semenova (yelena.semenova@des.wa.gov) for signature 2021-09-02 0:13:24 AM GMT
- Document emailed to Linda Newcomb (newcomb@linarchitect.com) for signature 2021-09-02 0:13:25 AM GMT
- Document emailed to Brad Olson (bradford.olson@mil.wa.gov) for signature 2021-09-02 0:13:25 AM GMT
- Document emailed to Sachin Saldanha (sachin.saldanha@mil.wa.gov) for signature 2021-09-02 0:13:25 AM GMT
- Email viewed by Yelena Semenova (yelena.semenova@des.wa.gov) 2021-09-02 0:21:19 AM GMT- IP address: 67.168.5.35
- Email viewed by Sachin Saldanha (sachin.saldanha@mil.wa.gov) 2021-09-02 0:57:29 AM GMT- IP address: 172.58.46.146
- Document e-signed by Sachin Saldanha (sachin.saldanha@mil.wa.gov)

 Signature Date: 2021-09-02 2:30:47 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 172.56.42.30
- Email viewed by Brad Olson (bradford.olson@mil.wa.gov) 2021-09-02 2:31:37 PM GMT- IP address: 174.246.52.148
- Document e-signed by Brad Olson (bradford.olson@mil.wa.gov)
 Signature Date: 2021-09-02 2:33:42 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 174.246.52.148



- Email viewed by Suzanne Gilbert (suzanne.gilbert@des.wa.gov) 2021-09-02 3:29:14 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.65.254
- Document e-signed by Suzanne Gilbert (suzanne.gilbert@des.wa.gov)
 Signature Date: 2021-09-02 3:30:22 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 73.169.232.32
- Document e-signed by Yelena Semenova (yelena.semenova@des.wa.gov)

 Signature Date: 2021-09-02 4:26:43 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30
- Email viewed by Linda Newcomb (newcomb@linarchitect.com) 2021-09-02 6:45:25 PM GMT- IP address: 66.249.84.89
- Document e-signed by Linda Newcomb (newcomb@linarchitect.com)

 Signature Date: 2021-09-02 6:48:57 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 172.56.44.202
- Agreement completed. 2021-09-02 - 6:48:57 PM GMT